

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-5, 9, 11, 22, 27, 29, and 31 are currently amended. Claims 32-35 are new. Claim 28 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1-27, and 29-35 are currently pending. Claims 1, 11, 18, 22, 26, and 27 are in independent form. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

In the Office Action, claim 31 was objected to as allegedly being intended to depend directly from independent claim 11 and not from dependent claim 28. Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-3, 7-13, 15-27, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,967,964 B1 to Svanbro et al. (“Svanbro”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,032,197 to Birdwell et al. (“Birdwell”). Claims 4, 5, 6, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)<sup>1</sup> as allegedly being anticipated by Svanbro in view of Birdwell, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,914,903 B1 to Miyazaki (“Miyazaki”).

Claims 28-30 were objected to as being dependent on an allegedly rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for recognizing the allowable subject matter of claims 28-30.

In view of the following arguments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the references of record. Therefore, this response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action.<sup>2</sup> Further, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicant expressly does not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). (Office Action, page 12.) However, Applicant believes that the Examiner intended to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

<sup>2</sup> As Applicant’s remarks with respect to the Examiner’s rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant’s silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

request that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.

## **I. Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to claim 31 “because it is claimed to depend on dependent claim 28” where the “Examiner believes claim 31 depends on independent claim 11.” (Office Action, page 2.) The Examiner further stated that “[i]f this is true, please make appropriate corrections.” (Id.) Applicant has amended claim 31 to depend from independent claim 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw his claim objection.

## **II. Section 101 Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being allegedly “non statutory subject matter” because the claims allegedly recite a “waveform (packet) which is a frequency.” (Office Action, page 3.) Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of claim 1 and although Applicant also disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of patentable subject matter under Section 101, claim 1 has nonetheless been amended to facilitate prosecution. Claim 1, as amended, now recites “[a] packet embodied in a tangible computer-readable medium,” thus overcoming the Examiner’s rejection. Therefore, claim 1, as well as claims 2-10 depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance as explained below.

## **III. Section 103 Rejections**

### **1. Independent Claim 1**

#### **a. “a compressed header . . .”**

As amended, independent claim 1 recites in part, “a compressed header comprising: a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header; and a second value associated with a

third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header.” The Examiner cited the Abstract and Figures 1 and 5 of Svanbro as allegedly disclosing these recitations of claim 1. (Office Action, pages 5-6.) However, although Svanbro discloses a first and a second field in a header compression key, Svanbro fails to teach or suggest at least this recitation of independent claim 1.

Svanbro discloses a header compression key (i.e. “Key 23” in Figs. 1 & 2 of Svanbro) including a first field and a second field. (Svanbro, Abstract.) The first field (i.e. “Field 1” as labeled in Figs. 1 & 5 of Svanbro) is used either in a first mode to “[distinguish] between different flows of compressed packets,” or in a second mode to “either . . . [distinguish] between the different flows of compressed packets or . . . [to distinguish] between different header compression identifiers.” (*Id.*) The second field (i.e. “Field 2” as labeled in Figs. 1 & 5 of Svanbro) is used to indicate whether the first field is used in the first mode or the second mode. (*Id.*) Svanbro further discloses a compressed header (i.e. element 24 of Figure 1), and an uncompressed header (i.e. element 24’).

Although Svanbro discloses a first field and a second field in a header compression key, these fields “[distinguish] between different flows of compressed packets” or “[distinguish] between different header compression identifiers.” Clearly, the first field and second field are not “a compressed header comprising: a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header; and a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header” as recited by independent claim 1. (Emphasis added.) For at least these reasons, Svanbro fails to teach or suggest at least this recitation of claim 1.

In response to Applicant’s arguments filed May 20, 2008, the Examiner further stated that:

**Svanbro** teaches that compressed key comprises two fields (see abstract “... a first subset of values for the first field of header

compression key is employed to distinguish between different header compression ...”).

(Office Action, page 2.) From this further statement, Applicant interprets the Examiner to mean that he is citing Svanbro because of Svanbro’s teaching of a header compression key comprising two fields, without regard to how those fields are configured. However, as stated here and above, independent claim 1 recites more than “a compressed header comprising: a first value . . . and a second value.” As amended, claim 1 now further recites “a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header; and a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header.” Svanbro lacks at least these elements recited by claim 1. Thus, the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Nowhere does Svanbro teach or suggest a first and a second value, where the first value is “associated with an uncompressed header” and where the second value is “associated with a third uncompressed header.” Moreover, nowhere does Svanbro teach or suggest “a first value . . . configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header,” and “a second value . . . configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header.” Svanbro in fact teaches away from a first and a second value so configured, through Svanbro’s contrary teaching of two fields, wherein one of the fields is used to indicate the data contained within the other field, not as an independent value.

Moreover, Birdwell is not cited for and, indeed, fails to cure these deficiencies of Svanbro. In contrast, Birdwell states that at most one uncompressed header is associated with a compressed header, as indicated at least by the “(0,y)” style notation for “reduced-length derivatives” of a “full-length data packet.” (Birdwell, Fig. 7 and col. 8, lines 46-56.) Thus, Birdwell teaches that a compressed header may be associated with just one uncompressed header, in fact teaching away from “a compressed header comprising: a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed

header; and a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header.”

Indeed, these deficiencies of Birdwell are in part a result of Birdwell being directed to a different field of endeavor, specifically, that of a unidirectional broadcast network. (Birdwell, Abstract.) Birdwell simply fails to address header compression over a lossy channel, let alone both packet loss and packet reordering; thus, Birdwell fails to teach or suggest a “third uncompressed header” as recited by claim 1.

As a result, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest at least “a compressed header comprising: a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header; and a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header.” For at least these reasons, the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1, as well as all claims depending therefrom, should be withdrawn.

**b. “where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order.”**

Independent claim 1 recites in part, “where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order.” The Examiner conceded that Svanbro fails to teach or suggest the recitation, but cited Birdwell’s abstract and stated that “[t]he system transmits both full-length data packets, which have compressed headers derived from associated uncompressed headers. [T]he server transmits a series of intermixed full-length and reduced length packets to the client.” (Office Action, page 6, quoting Birdwell.) Although Birdwell teaches storing compressed headers until their associated uncompressed headers are indexed into a table of received headers (see Birdwell, col. 8, lines 18-23), Birdwell fails to teach or suggest “where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order” as recited by independent claim 1.

Birdwell's Abstract discloses that:

A broadcast transmission system transmits data packets from a server to a client over a unidirectional broadcast network. The system transmits both full-length data packets, which have uncompressed headers, and reduced-length data packets, which have compressed headers derived from associated uncompressed headers. The server compresses the data packets by compressing the packet header. Compressed packet headers contain fewer header fields than their associated uncompressed headers. The server transmits a series of intermixed full-length and reduced-length packets to the client. As the packets are received, the client determines whether the packets are full-length or reduced-length. If the packet is full-length, the client stores the uncompressed header in a header table. If the packet is reduced-length, the client rebuilds the compressed header from its corresponding uncompressed headers in the header table.

(Birdwell, Abstract.) Thus, although Birdwell does disclose uncompressed and compressed headers "intermixed," the cited section of Birdwell fails to teach or suggest "where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order." Instead, Birdwell's Abstract indicates that reduced-length packets are rebuilt based on stored full-length stored packets, which would indicate that the full-length packets are first, not "packets arriving in any order." At most, the Abstract's disclosure of "intermixed" packets indicates that both full and reduced length packets may be transmitted over the same "unidirectional broadcast network," without regard to "packets arriving in any order."

Birdwell does contain disclosure of compressed headers being stored in a table if the "associated uncompressed headers" have not been received, namely that:

The header table 84 has additional space 90 to temporarily cache compressed headers in the event that their associated uncompressed headers are not yet received at the client and stored in the table. If a compressed header arrives at the client before the uncompressed header from which it is derived, the compressed header is cached until the associated uncompressed header is indexed into the table. In FIG. 7, the reduced-length data packet 60(1,0) is received prior to its corresponding full-length data packet 50(1). The packet decoder 80 places the compressed header CH(1) in a compressed header cache 90. After the associated uncompressed header UH(1) is received and stored in entry 1, the packet decompressor 82 retrieves

the cached compressed header CH(1) from cache 90 and rebuilds it from the uncompressed header UH(1).

(Birdwell, col. 8, lines 15-29.) However, this disclosure additionally fails to read on “where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order.” Birdwell clearly states that at most one header (“the uncompressed header”) is “associated” with a compressed header, but claim 1 recites no such limitation. At least because Birdwell includes this requirement, it cannot teach or suggest “where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order.”

The disclosed deficiency of Birdwell is particularly relevant within the context of claim 1. As noted above in subsection a, claim 1 further recites in part “a compressed header comprising: a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header; and a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header.” Since Birdwell does not teach or suggest, and in fact teaches away from this recitation within any context, let alone “arriving in any order,” Birdwell further fails to teach or suggest at least “where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order.”

In the Office Action, the Examiner further stated that “Birdwell teaches ‘ . . . [t]he memory location holds the uncompressed header from which the compressed header was derived . . . The packet header decompressor then reconstructs missing fields in the compressed header from the full set of fields in the associated uncompressed header.” (Office Action, page 2, quoting Birdwell, col. 3, lines 21-25.) Applicant does not argue that Birdwell fails to teach holding uncompressed headers, and reconstructing missing fields in the compressed header from the full set of fields. However, Applicant does argue that Birdwell fails to teach or suggest “where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order.” Birdwell cannot teach or suggest anything in relation to the relative ordering of three headers (uncompressed header, second uncompressed header, third

uncompressed header), when Birdwell itself only ever contemplates two headers (the compressed header, and the uncompressed header).

Thus, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest “where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order.” For at least these reasons, the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1, as well as all claims depending therefrom, should be withdrawn.

## **2. Independent Claim 11**

The Examiner stated that claims 28-30 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Accordingly, claim 11 has been amended to include the recitation of claim 28, and claim 28 has been cancelled. Independent claim 11 is now in condition for allowance.

Moreover, independent claim 11 recites in part, “a packet comprising: a first value for deriving said uncompressed header based on a second uncompressed header; and a second value for deriving said uncompressed header based on a third uncompressed header” and “maintaining said packet at said second network node until at least one of said second uncompressed header and said third uncompressed header are made available.” Similar to the arguments mentioned above with regard to claim 1, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest at least these recitations of claim 11.

As the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fail to teach or suggest “a compressed header comprising: a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header; and a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header” as recited by independent claim 1, the cited references similarly fail to disclose “a packet comprising: a first value for deriving said uncompressed header based on a second uncompressed header; and a second value for deriving said uncompressed header based on a third uncompressed header” as recited by independent claim 11.



Moreover, as discussed above with regard to claim 1's recitation "where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order," the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest "maintaining said packet at said second network node until at least one of said second uncompressed header and said third uncompressed header are made available." The Examiner conceded Svanbro fails to disclose these recitations and cited Birdwell, but Birdwell fails to cure these deficiencies of Svanbro. Birdwell clearly states that at most one header ("the uncompressed header") is "associated" with a compressed header. (Birdwell, col. 8, lines 15-29.) As discussed above in detail, claim 11 recites no such limitation. Thus, Birdwell fails to read on "at least one of said second uncompressed header and said third uncompressed header" as recited by claim 11.

Thus, for reasons similar to those described above in relation to claim 1, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest at least these recitations of independent claim 11. As a result, the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 11, as well as all claims depending therefrom, should be withdrawn.

### **3. Independent Claim 22**

The Examiner stated that claims 28-30 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Although claim 22 is an independent claim from which claims 28-30 do not depend, claim 22 has been amended to include a recitation similar to that of now-cancelled claim 28. As amended, independent claim 22 recites in part "maintaining a history of the most recently uncompressed packet headers." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is separately patentable. Thus, claim 22, as well as all claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

Moreover, independent claim 22 recites in part "a packet comprising a plurality of values corresponding to said plurality of packet headers, each of said plurality of values for deriving an uncompressed header" and "maintaining said packet until at least one of said plurality of packet headers is made available." Although claim 22 recites different details from those recited in claim 1, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell still lacks the required teachings.

As the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest “a compressed header comprising: a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header; and a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header” as recited by independent claim 1, the cited references similarly fail to disclose “a plurality of values corresponding to said plurality of packet headers, each of said plurality of values for deriving an uncompressed header.”

Moreover, as the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest “maintaining said packet at said second network node until at least one of said second uncompressed header and said third uncompressed header are made available” as recited by claim 11, the cited references similarly fail to disclose “maintaining said packet until at least one of said plurality of packet headers is made available.”

Thus, for reasons similar to those described above in relation to claims 1 and 11, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest at least these recitations of independent claim 22. As a result, the Examiner’s rejection of independent claim 22, as well as all claims depending therefrom, should be withdrawn.

#### **4. Independent Claims 18 And 26**

Further, independent claim 18 recites in part “forming a plurality of values by computing, for each of at least two transmitted in said plurality of transmitted headers, a corresponding value for deriving said uncompressed header” and “wherein said packet is received out of order of at least one of said plurality of transmitted headers.” Independent claim 26 recites in part to “form a plurality of values by computing, for at least two transmitted headers in said plurality of transmitted headers, a corresponding value for deriving said uncompressed header based on a corresponding one of said at least two transmitted headers” and “wherein said computer program product is configured to receive said packet out of order of at least one of said plurality of transmitted headers.” Claim 18 recites a method and claim 26 recites a computer program product embodied on

a computer-readable medium. Further, each claim recites different details. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell lacks the required teachings.

As the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest “a compressed header comprising: a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header; and a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header” as recited by independent claim 1, the cited references similarly fail to teach or suggest the formation of these values, let alone forming “a corresponding value for deriving said uncompressed header” “for at least two transmitted headers in said plurality of transmitted headers,”

Moreover, as the combination fails to teach or suggest “where said uncompressed header, said second uncompressed header, and said third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order” as recited by claim 1, similarly the combination fails to teach or suggest “wherein said packet is received out of order of at least one of said plurality of transmitted headers” as well as a computer program product similarly configured “to receive said packet out of order.”

Thus, for reasons similar to those described above in relation to claim 1, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest at least these recitations of claims 18 and 26. As a result, the Examiner’s rejections of independent claims 18 and 26, as well as all claims depending therefrom, should be withdrawn.

#### **4. Independent Claim 27**

The Examiner stated that claims 28-30 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Although claim 27 is an independent claim from which claims 28-30 do not depend, claim 27 has been amended to include a recitation similar to that of now-cancelled claim 28. As amended, independent claim 27 recites in part to “maintain a history of the most recently uncompressed

packet headers.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 27 is separately patentable. Thus, claim 27, as well as all claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

Moreover, independent claim 27 recites in part “a packet comprising a plurality of values corresponding to said plurality of packet headers, each of said plurality of values for deriving an uncompressed header” and to “maintain said packet until at least one of said plurality of packets headers is made available.” Although claim 27 recites a computer program product embodied on a computer-readable medium as well as different details, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell lacks the required teachings.

As the combination fails to teach or suggest “a compressed header comprising: a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header; and a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header” as recited by independent claim 1, similarly the combination fails to teach or suggest “a packet comprising a plurality of values corresponding to said plurality of packet headers, each of said plurality of values for deriving an uncompressed header.”

For similar reasons that the combination fails to teach or suggest “maintaining said packet at said second network node until at least one of said second uncompressed header and said third uncompressed header are made available” as recited by independent claim 11, the combination further fails to teach or suggest to “maintain said packet until at least one of said plurality of packets headers is made available.”

Thus, for reasons similar to those described above in relation to claims 1 and 11, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest at least these recitations of claim 27. As a result, the Examiner’s rejection of independent claim 27, as well as all claims depending therefrom, should be withdrawn.

**5. Dependent Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-17, 19-21, 23-25, And 28-31**

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-17, 19-21, 23-25, and 28-30 are in condition for allowance at least because they are dependent from one of the independent claims 1, 11, 18, 22, 26, or 27. Nevertheless, these dependent claims also recite independently patentable subject matter, representative examples of which are discussed in sections a-d below.

**a. Claim 6**

Claim 6 recites in part “said first value and said second value are encoded by at least one of: a variable-length code and a sign-based code.” The Examiner conceded that Svanbro and Birdwell fail to teach or suggest the claim recitation, but cited Miyazaki col. 14, lines 5-10 for the alleged teaching. (Final Office Action, page 11.) However, Miyazaki fails to teach or suggest “said first value and said second value are encoded by at least one of: a variable-length code and a sign-based code” as recited by claim 6.

The cited section of Miyazaki states:

According to a thirtieth aspect of the present invention, in the data transmission method of the twenty-ninth aspect, each of the item-basis compressed data includes data length information indicating the length of the compressed data. Therefore, the item-basis compressed data is restored with efficiency.

(Miyazaki, col. 14, lines 6-11.) However, that the compressed data may include length information does not teach or suggest “variable-length code,” merely that the compressed data may be of variable length. Indeed, Miyazaki discloses difference data, difference data length information, and compression type information, where the compression type is a “difference . . . from the reference data.” (Miyazaki, col. 20, lines 40-54.) However, Miyazaki fails to teach or suggest “variable-length code” or “sign-based code” at all, let alone “wherein said first value and said second value are encoded by at least one of: a variable-length code and a sign-based code,” as recited in claim 6.

Thus, for at least these reasons claim 6 is separately patentable.

**b. Claims 19 And 23**

Claims 19 and 23 each recite in part, “wherein a predetermined number of transmitted packet headers are stored.” The Examiner conceded that Svanbro fails to disclose the recitation, and cited Birdwell “Fig. 7 ‘HEADER TABLE’, and column 8 lines 15-30)” as disclosing these recitations. However, in contrast to “wherein a predetermined number of transmitted packet headers are stored,” the cited section of Birdwell merely discloses that a memory “M” of finite size may be used to store packet headers. (Birdwell, col. 8, lines 15-30.) Nowhere does Birdwell state that the number of stored transmitted packet headers is “a predetermined number.”

Moreover, Birdwell further states that “[t]he uncompressed headers UH(0), UH(1), . . . UH(M-1) stored in the table can be configured to time out or expire after a preset duration.” (Id., col. 8, lines 31-33.) Thus, Birdwell in fact teaches away from, “wherein a predetermined number of transmitted packet headers are stored” by its contrary teaching of removing items from the table based on time or expiration, not based on “a predetermined number.”

For at least these reasons, the combination of Svanbro and Birdwell fails to teach or suggest “wherein a predetermined number of transmitted packet headers are stored,” and the Examiner’s rejection of claims 19 and 23 should be withdrawn.

**c. Claims 29-30, And 32-35**

Dependent claims 29-30 previously depended from now-cancelled claim 28, and have been amended to depend from amended claim 11. Because claim 11 is in condition for allowance, claims 29-30 are also in condition for allowance because they depend from an allowable claim.

Claims 32-35 are new, and include subject matter similar to that recited in claims 29-30. Thus, as the Examiner indicated that claims 29-30 include allowable subject matter, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 32-35 are also in condition for allowance.

**d. Claim 31**

Claim 31 recites:

31. The method of claim 28, wherein maintaining said packet at said second network node until at least one of said second uncompressed header and said third uncompressed header are made available further comprises:  
receiving a second packet at said second network node, said second packet comprising:  
a third value for deriving said second uncompressed header based on a fourth uncompressed header; and  
a fourth value for deriving said second uncompressed header based on a fifth uncompressed header;  
maintaining said second packet at said second network node until at least one of said fourth uncompressed header and said fifth uncompressed header are made available; and  
deriving said second uncompressed header at said second network node based on at least one of said fourth uncompressed header and said fifth uncompressed header.

As the Examiner failed to comment on the subject matter of claim 31 in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that none of Svanbro, Birdwell, and Miyazaki teach or suggest at least that an uncompressed header may be derived from a compressed packet, and then maintained in turn for use in deriving an uncompressed header from a second compressed packet. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 31 is separately patentable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 65632-0527 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to this deposit account.

Dated: November 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Michael B. Stewart/  
Michael B. Stewart

Registration No.: 36,018  
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
Correspondence Customer Number: 25537  
Attorney for Applicant